

(♥ ♥) "In case you happen to be wondering, I'm a type-crittur, name o'
(+) Gerald. Me an' muh brother Fitzroy get conned into actin' like
(---) fan-types in this 'ere publication. Hell, it's a livin'..."

(o o) "We're rather
(-) unique creature
tures all in
all--we have the pow-
er to imitate the ap-
pearance of nearly
any science fiction
fan. Like:"

VAGUE 1

(♥ ♥)
(+)
(---)
!!!!!!
!Q!

Andy Young

(o o) "Too, we speak mostly in interlineations:"
(-)

!!!!!!
(- -) "Ghod, this Graveyard Reader
(--) is a fine book, but..."
((o))

(o o)
() "Whaddaya mean, 'Hya, Frogface!'"
(-)

(♥ ♥) "I say it's sercon,
(-) and I say to hell
(o) with it!"

THE FOCAL POINT OF EIGHTH FAANDOM

editorial jabber...

OUT WITH THE OLD, as they sometimes say, and in with the new. There were three issues of Fanjack published, and each of them had something wrong. It took me three issues to decide just what that something is, and once having done that, I knew I must correct the situation. Fanjack was an informal, relaxed sort of thing which unfortunately for its well-being contained stiff, formal, serious material, in the form of letters and book reviews. The writing did not fit the format, and vice-versa.

Once I had discovered this, I made quite a few changes, most of which are noted here:

1. I folded the weekly chatterzine-style fanzine, and in its place I am publishing a bi-weekly, pseudo-zine style fanzine.
2. VAGUE is primarily a discussion zine; however, it does not intend to completely snub more fannish things, and humorous articles such as the "Bulletinš" appearing in this issue are always solicited.
3. Instead of shredded wheat, I now eat corn flakes for breakfast.
4. I have decided to insist on some kind of response each issue or two from all readers. I should think that 20 pages or so on a bi-weekly schedule would be worth a letter, or trade.
5. A definite length restriction has been set on articles, columns, etc. submitted to VAGUE. I will NOT consider material over five pages in length unless I have specifically requested such material.
6. Dean Grennell has been placed on the mailing list.

With all due respect to Dean Grennell and corn flakes (in that order), I believe that numbers 1, 2, 4, and 5 are the most important and therefore deserve first attention. Number one: two reasons for the new schedule come to mind. First, and probably most important, it will allow letters coming from the far West to arrive at least in time to be in one of the first two issues following the one they are in relation to. Secondly, I can mail twenty pages every two weeks for exactly the same as I could have mailed ten pages per week, which cuts postage costs in half. Number two: VAGUE is primarily a discussion fanzine, and the editorial and letter sections of each issue should comprise about two thirds of the issue. Number four: I want a letter or card of comment at least every second issue, or, for irregular traders, every fourth issue. People who put out monthlies and bi-weeklies and happen to trade with me need not write at all, though of course letters are never discouraged. Number five: Articles, which at least until I get a back-log are solicited madly, should be under five pages (like, 4½) and preferably controversial. However, humorous material will never be turned away, providing the quality is up to my standards (since I have no standards, this point is of questionable value).

Issues will average 20 pages, although this initial one will probably run closer to 30. There are undoubtedly those who will be willing to wager that (1) the next issue will not be out in two weeks, and (2) will not be twenty pages. To these I say this: VAGUE will continue on its present schedule, size, and policy if the response is enough to justify it. I will not publish a fanzine if the readership does not show me it appreciates the effort, by contributing,

-----How many fans do YOU know who have a retired stud hamster?

by writing, and/or by trading their own publications.

THERE WAS A BOOK REVIEW planned for this issue which is becoming rapidly dated, but it was found that if I even hoped to hold the issue to a designated 20 pages, it would have to go. Since I spent several good hours writing and do not wish it to go to waste, and since I think it might be of some slight interest to the readership, I am excerpting portions of it for the remainder of this editorial.

"'Nine Tomorrows' is a collection of short stories by Isaac Asimov all revolving around a common theme: a fake-utopia, run by computers. The stories themselves, however, are vastly different, with a variety of different viewpoints and conclusions. This is an effect many authors strive for but cannot achieve. Standing alone, their stories may be fine examples of intelligently done science fiction, but when collected many stories revolving about the same theme tend to be repetitious and consequently boring. With his many different ideas on the subject, Asimov does not give one this impression. As a matter of fact, Asimov gives one very nearly no bad impressions in this book, although several stories are below par for one reason or another. In most cases, the reasons are indistinct gnawins, and may not be faults at all, but rather delusions on the part of the reader.

"The fault of 'I'm In Marsport Without Hilda,' however, is perfectly obvious to the reader. Isaac, in an attempt to be witty, has added much irrelevant material to the story. I stress the fact that the material so added serves only to aid the supposed humor and build up to the ending, and the usefulness of this is questionable. A story could just as well have been written around this plot...without a wife, a prostitute, and ther here's continued thoughts of the latter. As for the gimmick...any girl could have been described with equal results.

"The primary plot-idea is a good one, and given about a dozen more pages of interesting action instead of dull thoughts, it would have been an excellent science fiction story and one well worthy of the by-line 'Isaac Asimov'. As it stands now...the piece isn't worth a single reading.

"...Supporting my theory that if given more space Asimov becomes more interesting, the longest story in this volume, 'Profession,' is also the best. ...Excellence in literary value, excellence in entertainment...what more could you ask? Here Isaac presents the idea that everyone on earth is born suited to a certain profession, and that for the sake of production...the government allows the individual citizen to follow only that profession. To this, Isaac adds such things as Reading Day--when at the age of eight years the child is taught to read through the use of educational tapes--and Education Day--when the eighteen year old learns everything else that will be needed in his life... through the same process.

"However, there are bound to be exceptions. Some of the men and women...are creative and inventive, a quality which does not allow a single profession. These are sent to 'Houses of the Feeble-Minded'. Our hero eventually guesses the true purpose of his house through some help

--continued on back page

Sometimes I think my soul is full of weeds...

BULLETEN FROM THE SOCIETY FOR THE CREATION AND PROPAGATION OF UL:

The English language has been greatly enriched by the addition of useful coined words in recent years, words such as those given to it from Fanspeak, the jargon of fandom. The UL Society has decided to unveil this year's new creations in the latest fanish style in the humble pages of this magazine.

The first word to emerge from the brilliant minds of UL's master craftsmen is "Ul". Ul is an all-purpose word, combining in one handy portable grunt all the functions of such words as "dodad, thinggummybob, dingbat" together with, as added features, the meanings of all words and phrases whose meaning is understood without being stated. The outmoded "Good Morning," "good night," "Nice weather we're having," "Goodbye," and a hundred other meaningless social noises have been combined into one single master-wrd, "Ul." At the beginning of letters, where it is customary to put "Dear Sir," the trufan will now put "Ul Sir," or just plain "Ul." At the end, instead of "Yours Truly," the trufan will put simply "Ul, Joe Phan."

When two trufans are making love, they need not waste their breath saying "I love you. You're beautiful. Your love is true as the sky so blue. You think of such brilliant interlineations." They will simply whisper pashunately, "Ul, ul, ul," and the meaning will be clear.

Wilbert J. Realfan of the Boston Beanie Brigade has managed, during test runs on the new word, to live his life in a perfectly normal ways for five years without using a single word except Ul. Could you do the same? Try it. Once you have tasted "Ul", rolled its delicious flavor around on your tongue and let it gently drip from your lips like nectar from a flower, you will never again return to speaking the drab, prosaic English language.

--Ray Nelson

(v v) (o o) "Oh..."
(+) (-)
(---)

"No doubt you've heard of me, Fitz. I coined fandom's only contraction for 'fan-art'."

(v v) ((o o)) (o o)
(+) ((-)) (-)
(---) ((---))
AY JY LS3
The Ivory Birdbath Crew

(- -)
(o) "Ron Ellik has
(---) a cold nose..."

//////
(o o) Tucker with a
(*) hang-dog expression.
(---)
(+ +) ← neo
(o)
(=)

"Will you autograph this copy of Astounding Science Fiction, Mr. Gold?"

You're just saying that 'cause you think I'm simple-minded!

((Ed. Note. When this article originally appeared, about 75% of the comments thereon went something like: "That Harry Warner article was quite comment provoking, but I think I'll wait to see what others have to say about it before putting in my two cents' worth." As a result, there was almost no comment at all on the piece. I feel sure that my readers will not make the same mistake twice...))

so big

AN
ARTICLE
BY
HARRY
WARNER

Don't worry. This article isn't destined to reach the length of the novel by Edna Ferber whose title it borrows. She was writing about people in general, whereas I'm interested only in one phase of them, and a particular aspect of that phase that has been puzzling me.

Fandom is now about thirty years old, in the fanzine sense, a trifle older in the letterhack sense, much older as far as collecting fandom is concerned, and just entering its teens with regard to convention fandom. During those years, science fiction has grown from a rare product to be found in an occasional book and two or three magazines into a form of literature that may have challenged the western and detective story by now in published output and total number of readers.

You'd think that fandom would show some corresponding growth in numbers, to go along with the awakening interest in science fiction which has occurred in the mundane world since the end of World War Two. And it's true that you can count more fans today than you could twenty years ago. But I suspect that that growth is at least partly a delusion, and I have one theory which indicates that fandom will never get much bigger than it is right now, even if the American public should someday read no fiction other than science fiction.

If you'll consider the matter carefully, I think you'll find that the increase in the number of persons who are fans of one sort or another has occurred through the opening up of new fields of fannish endeavor, rather than through a general growth of interest in any particular phase of fandom. Unfortunately, statistics on national and international fan activity are scarce. There has been no consistent record-keeping over the years of the number of fanzines in existence, the number of fanzines that appear in the course of a year, or the number of individuals who are represented in fanzines as contributors and letterhacks. So at least it will be hard to prove me wrong in this contention: that there has been remarkably little variance in the past fifteen years or longer in the annual fanzine productivity for fanzine fandom as a

FROM
D.M. 3



Religion is the root of all evil!!!!

whole. If there were more pages of fanzines appearing per year today than there were when the American public first discovered science fiction, I'd immediately claim it's due to the opening up of new parts of the network, particularly Europe, as a prolific source of fanzines, rather than gains in the United States. Similarly, I don't believe that the total number of persons who contribute to or comment on fanzines is much bigger now than it was in 1945, or, for that matter, in 1939. In other words, fanzine fandom grew for a while from the early 1930's to the late 1930's or early 1940's, then stopped growing. I'll get around to the reasons for this a little later.

Convention fandom as we know it today is a later development. It was difficult for fans to do much travelling in the late 1930's because nobody had any money. The situation prevailed during the first half of the 1940's for different reasons: transportation troubles and the demands of the armed services. The fans who do little except visit other fans and attend conventions and conferences didn't become numerous until after World War Two. Give them five years to accumulate, then ask yourself if their numbers in 1950 were noticeably smaller than today. I don't think so. There has been a lot more attention paid in the fanzines to the convention fan in the past couple years, but this has been caused mostly by antipathies created by a few lamentable events.

Collecting fandom is harder to generalize about. It's members don't make themselves evident in specific concrete ways, such as fanzine production or attendance swelling. There's only the second-hand method of determining their quantities, by noticing how the dealers are getting along and by the amount of back-issue and old-book advertising that turns up in the fan press. Besides, collecting fandom has encountered rapid changes in its situation that fanzine fandom and convention-fandom haven't known. It's been almost twenty years since you could walk into a second-hand store in also any city and pick up treasures. It's been only ten years since a fan with a fairly limited amount of storage space could still hope to get complete runs of all the prozines. The drying up of sources and the need to specialize in some particular field if you're a completist-type collector must have shook up this fandom pretty radically in recent times.* I get the impression that there are fewer collector-fans today than there were a few years back. That might be a false idea, created by my lack of contact with the breed, but I don't think anyone can prove that collecting fandom is a rapidly expanding area of fandom.

Now, Americans are afflicted with a senseless worship of size and quantity. Bigness is usually considered good in itself, until events prove that it's bad for whatever has been growing. So a lot of people might assume that there's something wrong with fandom, for failure to grow in unison with the expansion of science fiction in general. But I would suggest looking a little deeper into the reasons why fans are fans, in an effort to find the real cause of the fairly static proportions of fandom. I think it's organic in nature, something deeply embedded in the nature of fandom. Just as the insects

*Ed. Note. This is true, primarily, tho the very same thing has happened, to a much lesser extent, to the other segments of fandom. One can no longer have every fmz. or attend every convention.

There is something very Cheechesque about Harlan

size is limited by his particular method of getting oxygen, and as the animal's dimensions are restricted by questions of gravity, I think that fandom is quite likely to remain eternally modest in proportions for a psychological reason, basic to humanity: fandom supplies egoboo, and there isn't enough egoboo available to keep too large a fandom alive.

At this point, I'm not going to go into a diatribe about fandom as an escape from one's real limitations, a never-never world in which one is praised for minor talents which go unnoticed in the mundane world, a sycophantic society that consists of mutual backrubbing. I don't think fandom is that way, to any serious extent. If it were, I still might enjoy being a fan, because there are worse things than indulging in the very human need for respect and admiration, and there are worse ways of getting adulation than being in fandom. But it's pretty obvious that most of us are in fandom for the pleasure it gives us, not because we think we're making the world a better place to live through our fanzines. We're fans because we like to get letters praising our publications, we enjoy spending two or three days in an alcoholic daze with jovial fan friends, or because the thrill of tracking down a rare magazine serves as a substitute for the excitement of the hunt for living creatures.

It's also easy to see how most fannish activities have built-in limitations on the number of persons who can get the fullest amount of enjoyment or egoboo. When the number of fanzines being published exceeds some approximate figure whose identity I don't know, a smaller proportion of the existing fanzines rate in the top ten on the polls, the material by the really expert fanzine writers is spread thinner and thinner, and the letterbacks are able to comment on a smaller proportion of the publications from sheer limits of time. The editors at the bottom of the quality heap are going to get disgusted pretty rapidly and some fanzines fold and the number of fan publications revert to the normal level. When conventions grow too big, wails immediately go up from the fans that they didn't know enough of the people on hand, and some of the convention fans drop out of this kind of activity until the gatherings grow smaller and more intimate again. When too many collectors enter the field, the prices rise and the possibilities of finding rarities decline, because of the strict limitations on the available supplies of old items. After all, how many fairly complete sets of *Weird Tales* have survived from the 1920's for collectors to hunt. There weren't many copies of *Quandry* published and there can't be many remaining unless or undestroyed for collectors to seek. You see the point?

Fandom isn't unique in this kind of size limitation. The service clubs recognize the situation and adjust to meet it in a special kind of way: Rotary and Kiwanis clubs rarely are allowed to grow larger than a couple of hundred members, and if the membership threatens to get too big, another club is formed in a city. That way, every member can get the kick of service by holding a place on a committee, ten percent or more of the membership will be holding office at any given time, every member will have the privilege of introducing a speaker at least once every year or two. The same thing happens with churches. Most congregations grow to a certain point, until there's not enough egoboo for most of the members to go around, whereupon a fuss starts within the congregation and part of it pulls out to start a church of its own,

'Fugghead' is a vaguely uncomplimentary term, no?

wherein they'll be plenty of new duties with missionary societies and sick committees to give every interested person something to do.

I might point out that some apparent refutations of this ungrowing fandom theory should have occurred to you by this time: for instance, the fact that FAPA has three or four times the number of persons seeking admission and the number of pages per bundle now, compared with its first years. But this is not a special kind of fan activity; it is simply one way in which fans express themselves. If a fan publishes 50 pages for FAPA, the chances are that he would have produced that much for subscription fanzine fandom, if FAPA hadn't existed.

There might be two morals in all this, if the theory is valid. One object lesson would be the uselessness for concern over the lack of new blood for fandom or the entrance of hordes of N3F'ers into fandom. If fandom's size is governed by its very nature, then they'll be new fans showing up when the old fans drop out to provide some excess egoboo; and the barbarian invasion from the N3F will peter out when these newcomers find there's not really enough room for them.

The other object lesson should be the obvious conclusion: the only way to make fandom much larger is to create additional kinds of fandom. I think that fanzine, convention, and collecting fandoms are the only current types that have large numbers of members. However, it's quite possible that changing conditions or interests will open up more avenues of egoboo. For instance, the day may come when prozines will once again feature long letter sections, making it possible for new Jack Darrows to become famous through no fan activity other than writing to the prozines. Circus fandom has a quite large subdivision devoted to an activity that hasn't shown up in science fiction fandom to any great extent--modeling. Maybe someday fans will be creating elaborate scale model replica's of Mrs. Carr with her head caught in an elevator, or Wollheim being tossed out of the first Nycon. If there's a breakthrough in the photographic field which makes possible a cheap, easy way to make 8mm sound films, there would be room in fandom for a lot of persons specializing in amateur science fiction movies; it's being done to a limited extent today, but it's not easy to get good synchronization for sound and not much fun to turn out silent, story-telling films. The constant growth of the total amount of science fiction that has been published might encourage the bibliographers to become so numerous that they'd form a sub-group of fandom, rivalling one another for completeness and accuracy. Maybe you can think of other possibilities.

Meanwhile, if you're looking for something new to do in fandom, a good task would be to research and provide the statistics to show if fandom really is standing still.

And here is our little bungle of love

LATEST BULLETTEN FROM THE SOCIETY FOR THE CREATION AND PROPAGATION OF UI

Hard on the heels of their announcement of the launching of this year's master-word, "UI", the craftsmen of the UI Society after years of research, are ready to unveil a brilliant companion for this star of the linguistic world.

For many years one of the prime contenders in the race for first place as an international language has been Basic English. It's main claim to fame is that it has only 18 verbs (come, get, give, go, keep, let, make, put, seem, take, be, do, have, say, see, send, can, will). The mad genius of the UI Society have discovered that all but three of these can be covered by a single modern up-to-date ulism. Here it is, folks. Get ready! Here it comes! Pult!

New, handy, portable "Pult" can replace all the outmoded verbs in your vocabulary. Pult is made up of "put, push, pull, place" and many others, with "to" added! Why go on saying "make" when you can say "put-it-up" or "Pult up". Why go on mumbling "I get" when you can say "I put-it-to me" or "I Pult Me". Why say "say" when you can say "put-out" or "pult-out"? With the addition of the handy, jiffy, reflexive for "self", the UI Society's pocket-sized marvel "Sh", you can throw away the word "go" and say instead "I put self there", or "I Shpult there". Instead of "come", "I shpult here". Retain only the suplimentary verbs "will" for the future tense, "have" for the past, and "can" for the conditionals and cleaning up afterwards. Pult and shpult can make verb-hunting a thing of the past. Remember, pult contains pure "put-it-up" and shpult 100% "put-self-to". With "UI" and "Pult" in your vocabulary, you'll never be at a loss for words!

--Ray Nelson

((o)) It came from (+ + +)
((m)) Outer Space! (v v) Bob Pavlat, pseudo-wolf.
((, , ,)) (+)
(- - -)

(o o) Isn't it astounding how I change my appearance?
(-)
(o o) Half-closed eyes like Robert Mitchum...
(+) (-)
(-)
Stern Old (e e) A round nose... ((- -)) "Oh,
Ted White (o) (((o)) Ghod, I
((- - -)) have a
(e e) A flat-top haircut... (()) neck!"
(o) ((())
(e e) A longer face... (())
(o)
(e e) And a different mouth. Makes a world of dif-
(o) ference, doesn't it?
(=)

DISJOINTED QUOTATIONS

(x x)
(o o)
(-)

"Let's create
7th Fandom again!"

Letters

JOHN MAGNUS Fanjack 1, and whatever must have inspired it, are unwelcome. I never called Bloch a has-been. It really hurts my occluded trufannish ego that the most attention I have attracted from fandom's two truly perennial immortals is thoroughly undesirable. In seven years and seven hundred pages of publishing, every scurrilious scrap of which Bloch has received, this is the longest and unfortunately the wittiest comment he has directed at me, or rather at something I am supposed to have said.

(I'm afraid that you did say that Bloch (also Tuck and Boggs) were "has-beens compared to what they were producing five years ago." I wrote that in DMOG #40 within minutes after ringing off from our telephone conversation, and find it unlikely that I could have so quickly misplaced the facts. Improbable, if not impossible.)

In all the zines Pauls sent me, I have not been able to discover the piece that inspired the Fanjack Letters. The only hint I have of what I am alleged to have said is what Bloch and Raeburn quote, and that is apocryphal.

The biggest reason I'm sticking my broken nose out of fandom nowadays is just such events as these. Young's reply to Varioso the Last was never sent to me. I suppose I could've gotten a copy at the Fapacon, but expected one directly, so neglected to take one. That could've been due to misunderstanding. White's self-admitted lies, however, were concealed for no reason other than their falsehood. He knows what a fair counterattack could do without resorting to calumny. Eney failed to send me the thing he published cautioning everyone not to send me the White opus--the apparent reason for that was to hide the tissue of lies he had spun the night before at a WSFA meeting when I asked him about the White Trash. When I remember Earl Kemp, standing up before the Detention to vent at hundreds of people his gripes against WSFA--which he had conveyed to the club itself--I begin to wonder if there are any fans who aren't backstabbers. I only have to begin to wonder, of course. Then I realize that there are quite a few honest fans.

Controversy, even insults, are part of fandom's fun. But up till a few years ago fans used to send people the things they published about them. When Harlan Ellison published a tirade against Galaxy, the Golds got an advanced, airmail copy. This is not so much to criticize Pauls for not sending me a copy of whatever he wrote about me. It is not even to criticize him for putting false (??) words in my mouth. These things do not make me happy, but Pauls' motive of wanting to get me active again take the edge from the sword. Instead, I'm writing this to suggest that that the vast changes in fanactivity in recent years are not in themselves sufficient reason to discourage me. But in the face of the increasing discomfort of lies, concealed attacks, even thefts

"I visualize the sex urge as a disease"

that I've experienced in the last year or so, it would take a helluva lot of high-quality fanpublishing to make it worthwhile.

((For one person, you seem to have had an awful lot of troubles. In my opinion, you have thrown over present-day fandom for a relic of the past which very likely did not exist in the way you represent it, probably in an attempt to justify your feelings toward 1960 fandom. These feelings may stem from many things: some, as it has been suggested, may be caused by the gaffiation of friends; more likely, you have simply run your course, or, in another phraseology, shot your bolt in fandom; too, it may be that you have dug your own grave with your perfectionist attitude. Picking isolated occurrences--the White Trash, Backblast, Kemp at the con--as representative of all that is going on, and compounding this by extremely vague references to thing you've "experienced in the last year or so", is simply a way of explaining away these feeling. I think that if you will only look back, you will find equally disgusting things which happened during your 'Golden Era'. Witness the Ellison blast in SF #8 as re the Indian Lake clave. If one can believe Harlan, that convention was the height of rottenness. Also, note the Ellison blast at Oberlin in 1955, and the return by the Youngs which was none too tame in itself. And have you forgotten the Censorship Feud off the early 50's?))

Pauls probably didn't understand this when he pumped me for information as to why I had quit publishing and quit WSFA. I told him that fandom was dead as far as I was concerned. He replied by saying that there were lots of fans around who were quite active. I asked him to give me an idea of his mailing list. Bloch, Tucker, Boggs, White, Carr, Hitchcock, Ellik, and several other names were mentioned. In fact, all but two or three names on his list were fans who had been more active five to eight years ago, Most had been in their prime then.

((Your straw-men are showing, Johnny. I never said that John Hitchcock was on my mailing list--Sean wasn't put on it until the last three issues of Dhog, and the telephone conversation in question was about mid-November. This may be an honest error, but it could also be a clever little straw-man. Should I have let that get by unnoticed, you could have mentioned at some future date that my "so-called active mailing list is composed of people like Sean who haven't been active in years." Disregarding that, we still have the second part of your paragraph to contend with. Of your list of seven names, I find only four who were "in their prime" during the period you mention. Tucker reached his peak long before, Boggs as well. Terry Carr didn't really come into his own until about 1957, with the publication of INNUENDO.))

Raeburn is talking through his hat, as Ellik's evidence illustrates. The fact is that Raeburn was a neofan during the period in question. He gets a few more fanzines now than he did then. My trading list at the time consisted of over a hundred fanzines. At one time Q, SFB, Hickman's TLMA, my SF, Tucker's Newsletter, FA, Orb, Cosmag, and I suppose many other zines had circulations over 300. Tucker, Silverberg, Willis, Hoffman, Bloch, Keasler, and many others were profuse writers. Raeburn is speaking from a serious ignorance of 1953 fandom.

Harry Warner, as I mentioned to Pauls during the misrepresented ((?)) phone call, is the one great fan who has produced more recently than

.....tortures which would surely shock any self-respecting degenerate
in 1953. Obviously, he is more interested in current fandom. But his reasons for being the Hermit of Hagerstown are roughly the same reasons for my current retreat. Unfortunately, Harry, there are hundreds of fans who have spoken with me in person. I can't maintain your objectivity. You mention 1955 as your frame of reference? Wasn't that the period when you were least active?

Ellik is the only fan with enough integrity to cite evidence. His figures disprove Raeburn's tripe. But Ron, is today's artwork better than Nelson's, de's, Hoffman's, Grennell's, Hickman's, Bok's, Bradley's... was in 1953? One or two zines--ones Ellik generally has something to do with--have stuff almost as good as Ellison used. There is much less crap, of course, because there are fewer zines to demand excellent wrk. Writing quality is better now than in 1953 only in the Bay Area. Silverberg, Boggs, Venable, Grennell, McCain, Willis, and many others could take on the best fifty writers to come along since then. Two or three could match them--the other forty--some could be beat by Bob Madle with all four heads tied behind him.

(Of the six writers you mention, three are still writing. The reason no great writers have come along to take their places is simply because those places have not been vacated. But: I would be willing to match Bob Leman against any or all of the remaining three, Terry Carr or Leslie Nirenberg against a dozen of their followers, with Bloch and Tucker standing by as a fifth column. Leman is not only one of the most intellectual writers to come along recently, but also a superb humorist. Nirenberg also has a gift for humor that should, within a year or so, develop into something fabulous. Terry Carr can write nearly every type of literature with equal skill. Bloch and Tucker have forgotten more about writing than Silverberg knows, and Redd Boggs could write rings around 50% of the Staff of LIFE Magazine. And goddammit, fandom still has as much sparkle as it ever had!

(It occurs to me that an appropriate ending for that paragraph would have been something like "Long Live Fandom!". I kind of let my anger take the upper hand there. Upon re-reading, however, I can only add that my more calm mind-chambers agree fully. Let's see Magnus make a comeback to that.)

I guess fandom isn't dead for everyone. But to me, fandom was hyperactivity. That was what drew me into it. If it were still as active, as varied, and as vital as it has been off and on for thirty years, I could put up with as much libel and petty bickering as Ellison once had to. But it's not worth the bother anymore. Certainly, the furthestest thing from my mind was that Bloch no longer attended conventions and meetings, or that he wasn't as honored or as deserving of honor as ever before. I suspect, Robert, that your 40-50 articles in the last two years was an exaggeration, eh? But it wouldn't have been an exaggeration seven years ago.

Finally, I would like to dispell the misconception that I don't know what's going on in fandom any more, and so am in no position to judge. Neither Pauls, Raeburn, Derry, or Warner were at the Worldcon this year. Neither of them have a fraction of the personal contacts I maintained until a few days before the Pauls phone call several months ago. Within the past few months I have served as president of the most

Eyes like a dead fish...hmeenotep?

active club in the country, spoke my first few words before a Worldcon assembly, travelled over 2,000 miles to fan-parties, had my first acceptance in a SFzine, written articles, and stenciled over thirty pages of fanzine. This may not be outstanding, but it proves that I'm not sour on fandom because I haven't put anything into it recently.

This was very hastily written, so I'd better list the major points clearly:

1. I didn't call Bloch, Tuck, or Boggs has-beens. (4?)
- (o o) 2. Paul's mailing list is made up of fans who made their names
(-) years ago. New fans haven't been able to create any similar
"Yes, interest in each other.
but..." 3. Objective weighing of evidence would show today's activity as a fraction of that of the 1952-54 period. A splash of quality can be found every few months, but no more than could be found in a week formerly. Cite names and titles for comparable periods if you want to refute this.

((I would once again like to Take Exception to your point three, and also to your mention, earlier, of SF's trade list "of over a hundred fanzines." This is fine. But by John Magnus' own admission, 90 of these 100 fanzines were crudzines. I quote from VAMP #9, May 1953, from an editorial by Magnus: "Actually, I don't think any subscription magazines below the top ten are worth reading." Refute this!))

GREGG CALKINS Though my calculus cries aloud to be studied, I'm afraid this letter in reply to your comments to Dick Eney has to be written. It also applies to my own case, for although I did send you the "required" postcard a few days ago, my feelings are nonetheless similar to Dick's in this matter.

Many more fanzines are put out every month than I can possibly comment upon, even if I were so inclined, and as much as I regret being unable to comment upon even the outstanding ones, I equally resent being required to comment "or else". This is not to say FANJACK is not a good magazine or an interesting one--though I'm sure you will agree that it is certainly not among the front runners in fanish poll favorites--but while I enjoy getting FANJACK and leafing through it, my pleasure thereby received is not as great as the inconvenience is going to be if I have to drop some sort of comments every month or so. If I feel like writing, I will; if I don't, I won't. I'll miss FANJACK, true, but in all fairness to you it isn't exactly what I would call the life's breath of fandom.

This is what I feel Dick Eney is trying to say. If his--and my--feelings in this direction run contrary to your editorial policy, then I'm afraid you'll have to drop us and say good riddance...we certainly are going to be deadwood as far as you are concerned, and we admit it.

((This letter was cut considerably from its original two pages for the sake of the more interesting comments ahead. But Gregg is right, at least partially. But I would like to know what the hell he considers comment-worthy material. Since Fl I've been getting two-four page letters from some of the deadest wood I've ever seen, and everyone who writes has at least a page's worth of pertinent comment.) I'm not cutting Gregg, though. I think I'll wait until he sees a couple issues of VAGUE

----- It was a case of great artistic talent and poor taste. -----

and decides whether or not there's been any improvement.→))

TED WHITE Yeah, sure, I'll play your silly ol' game. I think your dissertation on Numerical Fandoms is foolish--mainly because you have no first-hand knowledge and practically no second-hand ditto of the 1950-55 period you're talking about, "7th Fandom", or Quandry-6th.

(Of course, I have no first-hand information. I feel relatively sure that none of the present experts and scholars of the Renaissance Period were alive during it. As for second-hand information, I have read a considerable amount on the subject, plus the various fanzines I have from that period, and numerous browsings through Magnus' fanzine collection→))

"7th Fandom" was not "Ellison Fandom". It was a lot of things, and one of those "things" was an unusual manifestation known to his friends as Harlan Ellison--to his enemies he had more colorful names. But you might as well call that particular uprising "Grennell Fandom" (because it was formed at Dean's feet by a bunch of worshipful fans--Ellison, Harness, Ish, Magnus, and others--at a Midwescon and through correspondence), or even "Nydahl Fandom".

(According to Richard H. Eney in the Fancyclopedia II, "so-called" 7F was formed in Harlan Ellison's apartment, dubbed a "HECon" not a Midwescon.→))

I say that because the key fanzine following the death of Q was VEGA, published by Joel Nydahl. Joel published Dean Grennell's first fanzine appearance, and very soon was publishing Marion Bradley, Gregg Calkins, and Bob Tucker--in that order. Also appearing were Harlan Ellison, and your old neighbor, Marian Cox. The Annish (which was also the final issue, as things turned out) included Boggs, and a host of other BNF's. From the 5th to 12th issues (published monthly until the pause before the 100 page Annish; and that Annish was not just thrown together like a hundred-page SAPSazine--it was an ultimate distillation of fannish goodies) VEGA was the top fanzine going.

Harlan Ellison's SFB/DIMENSIONS, which never quite made the monthly or bi-monthly schedule he boasted for it, and whose Annish was three years late--that SFB/DIMENSIONS--was another damn fine zine, and during its more often appearances at about the same time VEGA was on the rise, it was an important zine. Each issue was so big that it might have been considered comparable to an average zine's Annish--and the 'names' Ellison crammed in were often unbelievable.

But the important factor in all of this was that "7th Fandom" worshipped the 6F of Q; each editor strove to out-do his peers in creating the sort of zine he thought would most perfectly emulate Q. "7th Fandom", like its predecessor, was "fun-loving". It strove to replace the Q era--not to supplant it. This is quite important: the names changed, but the goals remained similar. Sure, there were the clods, but there were more clods in

(v v)

(o)

(x) "My letterhacks don't understand me..."

--- He was so moral that some people thought he was only fooling. ---

Q's time, fans forgotten today. There were even good fans forgotten today; who remembers Duggie Fisher, or his ODD...? (Yet, in that zine Elseberry made his famous Nolacon report.) In fact, as we've drawn farther from the real era of Q, we've come closer to realizing the goals of that fandom. It is like the British, reading of US cons, putting on even more fannish ones, in the hopes of "coming up to" US standards...

Quandry-fandom was a cruddy era by today's standards, with only two to five really decent zines, and a tremendous number of absolutely unreadable crudzines.

If you want to make a case for a separate 7F--the real article, and not the self-named group who were only tail-enders to sixth fandom, trying to take it over where LeeH left off--you might try Psychotic. It was distinctly different in flavor, and yet I still think of it as the last dying gasp of 6F...

The Cult is a quite separate phenomenon ((I did)) from "7th Fandom". the "7th Fandom" movement started in 1953 and died by the beginning of 1954. PSYCHOTIC was established leader by mEd4'54 and ABSTRACT had arisen to combat it. Verzimer was the key figure in establishing The Cult, which he did in August and September of 1954 (contrary to what the FANCYC II says). The Cult was made up, almost without exception, of the "next generation" of fans after Ellison's crew. The Ellison bunch started in fandom in their separate ways in the midst of Q and were WKF's or neo-BNF's by 1952-53. The Cult group, by and large, started out in fandom around 1952-53, and were only beginning to make names for themselves in late 1954. There were exceptions; we had Russell Watkins, the self-appointed censor of Sixth Fandom, and Magnus was first on the w-l--but most of us were "the vanguard of eighth fandom"--or so it said.

You'll find it hard to convince me that "Seventh Fandom", the Cult, and the huge FAPA mailings were all part and parcel of the same "Fandom". They couldn't be more unrelated if they tried. I'm sure the colorless, lacklustre era Eney is referring to was the post-Psychotic period. And brother, it was. You don't know how good you're having it now...!

((Why yes, of course...))

You certainly did cut my letter--and I wish you hadn't omitted the portion about Bill Evan's style. You could have cut the bit about the 'k', however--it was strictly an aside to you, of no importance to the readers. You're not rubbing me the wrong way; I'm just being stern; surely you can tell the difference...?

((By now you've undoubtedly received E3 and have seen my reply to your comments on Bill's style therein. I suppose I can expect another letter from you within the week... The right to be STERN is the right to be FREE!))

Actually, I never "wrote to DHOG" during its second incarnation. You're thinking of Sylvia's card. Sylvia would be vexed to hear that you do not regard her as a separate individual, for all our duality. She is--quite reasonably--sick and tired of being known just as 'Ted White's wife' and being tarred (as well as--once in a long while--praised) with the same brush that is used on me so aptly by the more discerning in

You bitch, said Al Ashley

fandom. I'm sure you, Ted, appreciate our differences, which is why I was so shocked to see you listing me as writing to Dhog "only once". I trust you will correct this disastrous mistake in an early issue. Sylvia wrote to Dhog "only once". And to date she has not written to FAN-JACK at all. But then, she isn't writing to any others either....

(I fail to see how this misinterpretation is possible, although there are those who claim Ted White is an expert at misinterpreting. You wrote to Dhog once, Sylvia wrote to Dhog once. I did not specify if I was speaking of the early Dhog's--1 through 18--nor the later issues. I was speaking of all 43 issues.)

JOHN HITCHCOCK No, no, no, no, no. No. Read the damn last paragraph again. Says: "...a little dedication..." In three lines of Paulsing this becomes "...an extremely dedicated, fandom-is-all viewpoint." You can presumably understand the change from "little" to "extremely", so tell me where you got the "fandom-is-all"? Also, you used the word "viewpoint", whereas the original point concerns a feeling, which normally expressed itself in action (i.e., fanedding) and sometimes, secondarily, in intellectual frame of reference.

(Your "a little dedication" did not become "an extremely dedicated, fandom-is-all viewpoint" solely on its own. This was based, on your previous comments, Magnus' comments, and reading of the period you speak of. Too, my use of the word "viewpoint" is not so far-fetched as you seem to think. You say: "...the original point concerned a feeling, which normally expressed itself in action..." Carried one step further, this could well become "...a feeling, which created a viewpoint, and normally expressed itself in action..." Our feelings (i.e., our emotions) do govern our viewpoints--perhaps 'outlooks' would be a better word--to some extent. Of course, if neither you, nor Magnus, nor anyone else who has ever written on the 6-7F era intended this impression to be there, I am quite wrong. But it seems highly unlikely that I could delude myself to such an extent. The aura of Dedication, Hard Work, and Fandom Is A Way Of Life is very much in evidence to my eyes, both in the fanzines of that period and the writings--the nostalgic 'I remember's'--of fans who were active then.)

Now if we translate your remark, "an extremely dedicated, fandom-is-all viewpoint is useful, perhaps, in that it gives him something to editorialize about, joke about to his fellow fen, and inspires interlineations" into the original frame of reference, we'll have something like: A somewhat dedicated drive to create, in the field of fandom, is useful, perhaps, in that it leads him (thecfan) to edit and publish the best fanzine he is currently capable of.

(Nonsense! This "frame of reference" mumbo-jumbo strikes me as being a very clever way to elude the point. "...we'll have something like this..." Pooh! You're taking thoughts from your own head, writing them in the way I might have, and asking me to believe that if put in a different perspective, my own thoughts would have sounded like that.)

I think I'm partially borne out by your own rather peculiar train of thought within this very paragraph. NB: "Of course, I publish a ScrDed fanzine...because I think fandom needs...one fanzine where fans can get together and discuss...various subjects, sfnal or not." Ha! Dig the

(v v)	(o o)	lv vl	(+ +)	(* *)	(' ')	(" ")
(o)	(*)	l : l	(+)	(.)	(")	(:)
(=)	(-)	l...l	(o)	(=)	(*)	(---)
PGiant	HW Jr.	Beat	LASFS	Neo	clod	ConCom

FAN-TYPES AT A WORLD CONVENTION

 People don't generally die as often as they change their jobs...

motivation. See the fan drive at work in the very mind of Ted Pauls, leading him to edit and publish the most appropriate fanzine (appropriety is an essential part of bestness). Leading him to find the best spot and try to fill it. If it weren't for this very fan drive, your eight-page sixty wouldn't be coming out once a week.

((If you're trying to say that the fan drive exists within every fan, I heartily agree. I freely admit the existence of such a drive, and further admit that it is a Good Thing. But, there is more to fandom than that. You have thoroughly explained gafia, why people publish monthly, and probably cancer as well. Unfortunately, you have said nothing new. The fandom of 1952-54 was STILL too stiff; STILL too Dedicated; STILL too serious about itself. Monthly fanzines were published NOT because the editor wished to publish monthly, NOT because there was enough excellent material around to warrant it, but because highod they HAD to publish monthly. It was a duty to their readers to publish monthly. True, in some cases this was an exceedingly Good Thing; some, like Q, SF, et al became fabulous. But a much larger percent sunk into the bog of mediocrity.

((There is still an acute fan drive within most trufen. The only difference is that now much of this drive is diverted into things other than publishing. Seven years ago, you were either a fanzine-fan, a club-fan, a convention-fan, or perhaps a fringe-fan. Nowadays, it is possible to publish an excellent though irregular fanzine, keep up a bi-weekly newsie, hold and attend fan-parties, attend regional club meetings, travel great distances for fan visits, and go to world conventions. This is where the extra fan drive goes.

((The reason I publish so frequently, show, I assume, a touch of the old fan drive, is that I do NOT attend conventions, parties, or club meetings, and the longest distance I usually travel to meet a fellow fan is something like three miles. My fan drive, which cannot be used up in this way, is diverted into fanzines.))

Is Serious Discussion a Good Thing? I refuse to use the words "Good Thing," with or without caps, in a serious discussion.

((This is a fine example of what I mean by a stiff, overly-dedicated viewpoint. The caps, as you doubtless know, are for humor value...if you won't allow even this much humor creep into your discussions--serious discussions--it must be awfully dull to argue with you. Too, the capital letters serve a purpose--they make obvious the Horrible Cliches which creep into our conversation. But, Christ, if I can't laugh a bit while I'm discussing, I may as well quit now.))

Pavlat: A thousand pages a month of WHAT? Bob, I read a two month's sampling of the fanzines received (August-October) by Ted Pauls, one of fandom's most active fans. Maybe two months isn't enough, as Jean suggests. But I went through every rag in the pile.

((The #rags" John read were as follows (in part): Syzygy; Yandro; Spectre #5; Retrograde; Spectrum; Cry; Outworlds; Shaggy; Quixotic; Phantasia; Twig Illustrated; and Fanac. Only two of these fanzines could be called crud by my standards; a few more could be termed rags by the standards of other current fans; perhaps Magnus, perfectionist that he is, could dismiss the next half-dozen. But by NO standards cou could two of these zines be called poor! I would be willing to compare Retrograde and Spectre for literary quality with ANY fanzine of the last 10 years.))

Aaaaarrgh!! You have wrenched my last sentence completely out of context. It hurts. Phyllis Economou had suggested Magnus and I have passed through the dulling experience of growing up, thus losing the childhood sprung sparkle of Newness, in our New, Adult Social Adjustment. I, in turn, CLEVERLY suggested right back that fandom had lost its spark and that fans on the whole seem happier, better adjusted and more mature. Hence, they produce less (artistically, not in quantity) because of less need to. Less frustration, less creation. And by the way, Ted, I didn't "accuse" fen of "merely having a good time." That's what normal, well-adjusted folk are supposed to do in a hobby.

((I kind of hate to be the first to break the news to you, since you have obviously led a rather sheltered life, but...John, fans are N*O*T normal and well-adjusted. In fact, I remember you saying of Marian Oaks, "...she was so normal!"))

Why don't you really defy that Ted White and immortalize that little block in the 'k'?

Like, excelsior, man!

(o o) "Editor Pauls informs me that
 (-) he is joyous to the extreme in
 that he has managed to hold this
 issue to around twenty pages."

(- -)
 ((o))
 (=) "Ghed, I
 have ears!"

((* *)) I know all about starry
 (*) ry-eyed neos, but this
 (**) is prepostrous!"

 (o o)
 (+)
 (===)

"I just met Dean Grennell!"

iiiiiii
 (o o)
 (-)
 ()
 (===)

Ubangi...

////
 (v v)
 (o)
 (---)
 TGC

...
 (o o)
 (+)
 RDE

Berkeley Fandom...

STILL ANOTHER BULLETEN FROM THE SOCIETY FOR THE CREATION AND PROPAGATION OF UL (NOW COMBINED WITH THE SOCIETY FOR THE DESTRUCTION OF ENGLISH):

It has come to the attention of the board that certain fen are corrupting the purity of fanspeak by the adoption into their vocabularies of words from other languages, such as "jive", the language of the beats, jazzmen, dope addicts, and other such no-goods. If this dastardly practice is not put to a stop, we shall be forced to forbid the speaking of languages other than fanspeak altogether! The wordsmiths of Ul can manufacture words to fit any possible fannish needs, so there is no need to bring in any foreign words, putting honest fanlinguists out of a job.

The worst offender in this respect is the word "dig". In jive, "dig" is a regular verb meaning "to understand, to like, to see" and, in general, "to be aware of". Fanspeak is not just pulled out of a hat this way. It is carefully formed by the combination of two or more English words into one, by means of their initials or principle syllables. Sercon is a combination of serious and constructive; Gafia of "Getting Away From It All." Fanspeak is logical, reasonable, and (need I say it?) beautiful. Jive is a pimple on the body politic.

Rather than use this ugly foreign importation, the trufan simply forms a word having the same meaning. The trufan word for "dig" is pulty, formed from "pult" (put-ul-to) and eye. Instead of saying "Dig that square," the trufan says "Put-to-eye-that-serious-constructive-fan" or "Pulty serconfan!" "Let's make it to the flicks and dig Bardot" in Ul would be "Let's shpult bid (or trid if it is a 3-D pic) and pulty bardot." In fanspeak, all objects are classified by the number of their dimensions--thus, an idea is zero and called a zed; a line has one and is called a monod; a movie has two, so is called a bid; addaa solid object is a trid.

Then an object having both length, width, depth, and a fixed period of existence--in other words, an object with a time-dimension--is a kwid (Ul is phonetic). Obviously, the process of adding dimenhsions can go on indefinitely. (And should).

Well, I got to shpult now, pulty you later!

--Ray Nelson

(* *) "Alas poor Wilson, I knew him
(-) well. He was...Wilson! What the
(=) hell are you doing here!?"

(o o) "I'm somewhat omni-
(.) present, aren't I?"
(o)

(* *)
(+) "And I hope you noticed how very little these expressions on
(---) this page seem to fit the text."

EDITORIAL JABBER

continued

from a Social Scientist and his own imagination, after frantically escaping from the place. The author, as pointed out by the author through the lips of George Platen, the central character, is obvious yet elusive. The gentle horse-laugh from Asimov for not seeing the forest for the trees makes this story all the more enjoyable.

"... 'The Feeling of Power' is a good story concerning the final stage of computer progress: reversion to the human mind, a forgotten art at the time of this story. The dialogue, specifically the incredulity expressed by... various characters... when shown that the human mind could actually multiply, is sheer poetry, and the plot, although basically unoriginal, is well-done.

"The plot of machine controlling all the world is carried one step further in 'All The Troubles Of the World'. The machine, a large computer called Multivac, finally gets sick and tired of bearing the burden of all of humanity's aches and pains. It decides to commit suicide, and quite naturally the government cannot allow this... because the whole works would simply fall apart without the guidance of the Brain. Interestingly enough, Multivac reports its own death in its daily crime report (reported before it happens so that crimes can be stopped). But how to stop it? The authorities are successful in preventing the first attempt, but the Brain will obviously try again, and next time... it may not fail. ... Here Asimov leaves you to contemplate the horrible end."

If that review seemed patchy, please bear in mind that it is cut down from three pages of hear-solid type.

(o o) "Until next issue..."
(-)

Ted

VAGUE 1

FROM: Ted Pauls
1448 Meridene Drive
Baltimore 12, Maryland
USA



TO:

Rick Sneary
2962 Santa Ana
South Gate, California

PRINTED MATTER ONLY

RETURN POSTAGE GUARENTEED

MAY BE OPENED FOR POSTAL INSPECTION.